

THE BIBLE: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE BIBLE:

INTRODUCTION

We present the facts of the History of the Bible from the most authentic Christian sources, The Catholic and Protestant churches with references. Kindly check the references to verify the quotations. We present our research in a systematic manner so that one can make one's own decision.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH: UNDISPUTED FACT THAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRISTIANITY: THEY CREATED THE FIRST BIBLE

For centuries an all-powerful Roman Church was the only Church of Christianity, until the 16th century when Martin Luther formed the first Protestant church in Germany. The 'Holy Bible' has indeed inspired thousands into engaging in morally up righteous work, it also stands as a book accepted as "divine", by many.

At the outset, the writer of this booklet is not an enemy of the Bible, but rather appeals to Christians to reason and ponder upon the facts presented.

It is a command in Al-Qur'ân to spread the Truth and that is our duty for presenting this information:

Chapter 2 verse 42: "And cover not truth with falsehood, nor conceal the truth when ye know (what it is)."

Chapter 16 verse 125: "Invite (all) to the way of thy Lord with wisdom and preaching; and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious: for thy Lord knoweth best, who have strayed from His path, and who receive guidance."

Chapter 2 verse 256: "Let there be no compulsion in religion: [...]"

THE BIBLE

Firstly, the name Bible originates from the **Greek language, Byblos**. So the book named Bible has its name from the Greek, a language Jesus never spoke. Also, the name Bible is not mentioned **within** the text of the Bible, i.e.; inside the Book, but it is the title only on the cover.

Secondly: The Old Testament is claimed to be in **Hebrew**, a language that was only completed in 916 A. D; which is about **300 years after Al-Qur'ân**. I shall give the reference of this further on.

Mûsâ, or as is known to Christians know as Moses did not speak Hebrew because he grew up in the household of Pharaoh from a baby.

Thirdly, according to the Catholic Church the creators of the first Bible dating back to 323 C.E.; they have no knowledge of the actual language Jesus spoke. They claim that Jesus spoke a dialect of Aramaic, but have no evidence of which dialect, so therefore are no original sayings of Jesus in the language he spoke. We will provide evidence further on from Authentic Church records, i.e.; Catholic, Protestant, Apostolic and Jehovah Witnesses Churches.

THE BIBLE:

POINT NUMBER 1

After studying the preface of the **1881 New Testament**, one is forced to believe The New Apostolic Church who revealed that during *sixteenth century* of the Reformation there ‘...*existed in no other language but Latin...*’ a Bible of the Roman Catholic Church.

Reference: History of the Kingdom of God”; New Apostolic Church, Dortmund, Germany, Vol 1, 1st edition 1971 [1998 Edition]

This fact is further supported as follows in the 1881 Bible:

“A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of **two competing reading in the Greek**, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various which might properly affect the translation. When these were adjusted, our deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version had next to be indicated, in accordance with the fourth rule; but it proved inconvenient to record them in the margin. A better mode however of giving them publicity has been found, as the University Presses have undertaken to print them in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that fourth rule, by requiring that ‘the text to be adopted’ should be ‘that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,’ was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times, and therefore to employ the resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. **Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament**, forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion among competent critics. Different schools of criticism have been represented among us, and have together contributed to the final result. In the early part of the work every various reading requiring consideration was discussed **and voted on by the Company**. (Reference: 1881 Bible: page xli) (Our emphasis)

Note: We would like to point out the following in the abovementioned statement:

- 1) **“A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work;**
- 2) **two competing reading in the Greek,**
- 3) **Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament,** (textual criticism will be explained further on according to the Catholic Church’s definition)
- 4) **and voted on by the Company.** (the company voted what is to be included or excluded from the Bible)

POINT NUMBER 2

Those who claim to believe that the Bible is the word of God must also consider the following arguments:

Let us assume that Nabî Mûsâ (or Moses) could have spoken Hebrew¹ or even Aramaic, then, we must also agree that Pharaoh would never have spoken with him in Hebrew or Aramaic, which must have been the *slave languages*, as the Children of Israel were the slaves of Pharaoh at that time. *Therefore, it stands to reason that Nabî Mûsâ (Prophet Moses) and Pharaoh must have communicated in the Egyptian Arabic language. This is supported by:*

The New Bible Dictionary 1988 Edition, p. 305 states:

“A further implication is that Moses would have an Egyptian education, one of the best available in his day.”

Be that as it may, ***Pharaoh would never have spoken with him in the language of the slaves!*** Even if we want to agree that Nabî Mûsâ spoke Hebrew, then we must also agree that the communication with Pharaoh must have been in the **Egyptian language**. As we know even today in the 21st century Egyptians speak a dialect of Arabic, including the Christian Egyptians and Jews living there.

POINT NUMBER 3

The New Testament’s authenticity from the Vatican Catholic Church’s official records state:

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH:

“Bible, Manuscripts of the. Copies of the Biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and **printed copies** of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. **None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals.”**

[Our emphases] (*J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30*)

It is very important to note the in the statements above: (1) **“None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals.”** and that informs us that the copies they have do not have any originals to back up the copies. In other words the copies they have can never be verified to be true or authentic because there are no originals to

4: According to Peake’s Commentary of the Bible the word **Hebrew is a Greek word**: See Peake’s Commentary on the Bible 1919, :¹ p. 34; Peake is a world renowned Biblical Scholar. [His full details are: Professor Arthur S. Peake. Rylands Professor of Biblical exegesis in the University of Manchester; Prof. In Hartley College, Manchester; Sometime fellow of Merton College, Oxford. His voluminous works have been printed by Thomas Nelson & sons Ltd of London].

be compared to. (2) **“Printed copies”** inform us that these are very late in the history of the Bible, because printing presses were invented in the 16th century.

Leaving aside the Old Covenant’s problem, (as Christianity is not really based on it) we have the same problem with the New Testament. According to the Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be **Aramaic**, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time. Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue (language) of Jesus, since:

Quote: “... no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic] remains we cannot determine precisely the dialect he (Jesus) spoke” [our emphases]. (J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30)

PROTESTANTS

The Protestants concur with the Catholics because they do not possess any so called ‘original manuscripts.’ According to the Catholic Church every sects that broke away from the Catholic Church are ‘apostates’, because they changed some parts of the Bible, left out some books, and no longer follow the exact same teachings, or beliefs as the Catholic Church who are the creators of the first Bible. The Catholics have 46 Books and the Protestants have 39 Books in their Bible. (The Jews follow the Protestants Bible).

The significant point to remember is that these so called original ‘manuscripts’ are in **Greek**, which Jesus never spoke. So what truths can one extract from such manuscripts that are in tiny bits and pieces² in a foreign language? *Refer to:* “in the early part of the work every various reading requiring consideration was discussed and voted on by the Company.”

Quote: “Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors.” (New Bible Dictionary, 1978, p. 151)

Pope Damasus who was the “Pontifex Maximus” for the state entrusted this task to St. Jerome. The following statement bears the information from which this inference is drawn:

Quote: “The Vulgate is the translation of the Bible into Latin by St. Jerome (340-420). About 383 A.D, at the request of Pope Damasus, he began revising the Old Latin version of the Gospels according to the Greek. He probably revised the other books of the New Testament at the same time. Beginning about 387 in Bethlehem, he revised the Latin version of the protocanonical books... of the Old Testament according to the Greek in the Hexapla of Origen. About 390 Jerome began a new Latin translation of

² These tiny bits and pieces of information form the basis of ‘Textual Criticism’: meaning through conjecture and assuming what could have been and not been and then written in the Bible

the whole Old Testament (except 5 deuterocanonical books) **from the original Hebrew**. The Vulgate is made up largely of Jerome's work in these three revisions and versions. Thus in the Vulgate, the New Testament is his first revision according to the **Greek**. The Psalms are from his revision of the Old Testament according to the **Greek** in the Hexapla of Origen. The protocanonical books of the Old Testament are from Jerome's translation of the **Hebrew**. The five deuterocanonical books omitted by Jerome (Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, 1 Machabees, 2 Machabees) are from the **Old Latin** version."

Please note the following in the above statement:

- 1) **"The Vulgate** is the translation of the Bible into **Latin** by St. Jerome (340-420). About 383 A.D, at the request of Pope Damasus, he began revising the **Old Latin** version of the Gospels according to the **Greek**.
- 2) he revised the **Latin** version of the protocanonical books... of the Old Testament according to the **Greek**
- 3) About 390 Jerome began **a new Latin translation** of the whole Old Testament

Note: The languages referred to as Latin and Greek, which Moses and Jesus never spoke, the Hebrew Language was only completed as a language in 916 A. D, about 300 years **after** Al-Qur'ân, and something to ponder on is that God would never have revealed His message in an incomplete language.

PROTESTANT VIEW POINT OF THE VULGATE

As stated above, Saint Jerome was assigned to **revise the Bible**: Before continuing let us define the word Revise so as to remove any mis-understanding: *Revise means to:* amend, modify, adjust, alter change, correct, improve, and re-work. The question that should be asked is: if the Bible is the word of God, can man improve it by changing, amending, correcting, and altering it etc? That we leave to the Christian Scholars to answer. Let us continue: Saint Jerome:

"He was commissioned by the then Pope to produce a **Latin rendering of the whole of the Bible, and he began by **revising for the NT** and the Psalter the existing translations **into Latin**, the so-called Old Latin texts, to bring them into line with the LXX [Septuagint]."** [Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 1962, 58c, p. 75]

Hence, the Vulgate of Jerome became his original work, which means that no other Vulgate existed before his time. It could also mean that the original Vulgate could have existed between 340 and 420 C.E and therefore had to be translated from a non-vowel text *if there was one*, as the vowel system only emerged in the 7th century C.E or during "C.E 500 to 1000". **However, the point in question is that the Vulgate of Jerome had to be "in line with the LXX"**. If this is so, then the Vulgate of Jerome is also an unreliable source as the Septuagint is said to have been the work of '**ignorant**' scribes. Reference: Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, p. 63)

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

A study of Textual Criticism is necessary to understand the significance and impact with the most recent information at hand, namely the Dead Sea Scrolls, had on Biblical history and understanding. The Catholics explained it as follows:

“The science that seeks to determine as nearly as possible the original biblical text as it was written by the authors themselves. This science applies to other literature besides the Bible, for example, to the Latin classics such as the works of Horace or Cicero, or to the plays of Shakespeare. In each case, all the available evidence is gathered to determine the history of the transmission of the text, and then compared **to establish what seems to be the original text.** There are two kinds of evidence which the textual critic uses in order to determine the text: external (documents) and internal (conjecture). As regards external evidence for both the Old and New Testaments, there are **thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts** which have been preserved through the centuries. Besides, there are many copies of the old translations of the Bible, such as the **Greek Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, and the Syriac Peshitto.** All these versions are important because they tell us about **the state of the biblical text at a time not long after the original text was written.** Hence the textual critic must master all these Languages in order to use these sources, and then by comparison of text and translations he strives to reach the original reading. Some parts of the Bible have been corrupted (i.e., the original reading has been lost) during the course of its history. **If the corruption occurred very early, it may be impossible for the textual critic to arrive at the original by use of documents.** Then he must resort to conjecture: taking into account the context, and various possibilities of error in the script, he strives to restore the text as he conceives it was originally written. For example: “Return, O Lord, you who ride upon the clouds,” in Numbers 10:36 is a conjectural emendation of a corrupt Hebrew text. While the substantial integrity of biblical text has been preserved by the providence of God; **there is still a place for textual criticism,** as the Church recognizes. In the *Divino afflante Spiritu...* Pope Pius XII said that the art of textual criticism is “quite rightly employed in the case of the sacred books...to ensure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, and be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists...” [*Our emphases*] (Reference: J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, pp. 242-243.

In essence, Textual Criticism forms the basis of Biblical establishment and compilation. From the aforementioned, we deduce that the authors or Textual Critics mastered the languages of copies or at least translated copies of an unknown Bible. What pertinence can be embodied in the works of the Textual Critics if no knowledge about the original text exists? Is it possible to accredit constructive significance to a text, which is said to be **near** to the original without the latter being available?

The question that arises is: **Since when can a piece of work based on a copy of some book, which is claimed to be a copy of the lost original in translated form, project valid support in favour of the meaning of the original?** It is strange to refer to the term “corrupted” as “the original reading has been lost,” again implying that corruption became due to “carelessness of the copyists.” The corruption could only be due to the reproduction of verses, which were non-existent.

Quote: **“There are no very ancient MSS. [MSS = Manuscripts] of the Hebrew Bible, and of such as have come down to us, all belong to the same family or recension. The earliest dated Hebrew manuscript known was written in 916 A.D. another, undated, which has recently been bought by the Trustees of the British Museum, is probably a little older. Many were destroyed in the Middle Ages, and others were buried through the pious, if mistaken, reverence of the Jews. That other recensions were at one time in existence is shown by the variations in the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, by means of which we are able in some cases to reconstruct the original which they represent”** [‘The Holy Bible 1896 Oxford: Printed at the University Press’]

Please note the following in the above statement:

- 1) There are no very ancient MSS. [MSS = Manuscripts] of the Hebrew Bible,**
- 2) The earliest dated Hebrew manuscript known was written in 916 A.D. (about 300 years after Al-Qur’ân)**
- 3) variations in the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, by means of which we are able in some cases to reconstruct the original which they represent”**

POINT NUMBER 4

The Catholics deny the claim that Matthew wrote ‘The Gospel according to Matthew.’ We refer to the Catholic claim:

“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. **But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.**” (Reference: Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopedia Vol. 1, 1965 p. 141)

For the reason that Matthew’s text is non-existent, and the latter is a primary source used to derive Jesus’ name, we deduce that **none of the names are divine.**

We remind again what the Catholic and Protestant Churches states: *Quote:*

“Bible, Manuscripts of the. Copies of the biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. **None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired**

authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals”

[*Our emphases*]. (Reference: J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited :London, 1959, p. 30)

“Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into **other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors”** [*Our emphases*]. (Reference: New Bible Dictionary First Edition ,1978, page 151 .In the 2nd edition of 1988, page 140)

According to the Virtues Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be Aramaic, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time. (Reference: J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, page 30)

If this is so then the **Essenes** could also have spoken Aramaic, as Jesus grew up amongst them in his boyhood years. (See Peake 1962, p. 734:639 h)

Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue [language] of Jesus, since “...no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic] **we cannot determine precisely the dialect He spoke”** [*our emphases*].³ At this point, we would emphasise that the fact that Jesus’ dialect of Aramaic is unknown, one can already realise the daunting task the Textual Critics face in completing the NT, which at this point in time remains a “vast and unfinished” task. In fact this is what they have stated in New Bible Dictionary 1978, page 1269:

“Thus the task of New Testament textual criticism is vast and unfinished.” Keep in mind that this was said in 1978, and as yet it is still continuing.

This means that the words in the New Testament do not belong to him, but to the hundreds of Textual Critics over the past 1,500 years!

The Children of Isrâ’îl, are the off-spring of Prophet Ya’qûb [Jacob], and the Jews are the offspring of the Greeks and Romans. (Refer to : ‘The History of The Jews’ by Al-Hajj Mofsowitz Potashnickh [ex Jewish Rabbi from Romania]

WHO ARE THE JEWS?

: J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.

In the same way the Jews are the offspring of the women of the Children of Isrâ'îl who were raped by the Pagan Greeks whose children became known as the Sons of Darkness⁴, then came the Pagan Romans who raped the women of the Sons of Darkness and their offspring became known as the Jews. (History of the Jews by Mofsowitz Potashnickh)

This would imply that not one Gospel is authentic! Until proven otherwise, the Old and New Testaments are not Divine books. The important point to understand is the fact that the history of the Old and New Testaments has a well-known undisputed history of its reconstruction. This is accepted amongst the scholars of Christianity – especially those who are truthful. It is a known undisputed fact that there is not one copy of any of the original manuscripts of the two books, the O.T. & N.T. of the Bible, known to exist in the world. Even if one claims that there are only copies of the originals, then such a claim has no evidence to support it.

We refer to the Real Christians who have of the Bible **46 books** and states under the rule of 'His Holiness Pope John xxiii' the following:

Quote: “None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist...” (Reference: Catholic Bible. P. 30)

Never mind the manuscripts, the language in which the original came is unknown. After examining the above information one find it difficult to consider the Bible as a source of divine revelation or a book of inspired contents.

It is important to state the Biblical History as reported by those who broke away from the Roman Catholic Church. The Holy Bible opens with the following words:

“To the most high and mighty prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c.”

This 1896 Bible reveals that Genesis chapter one began in the year 4004 BC. According to the book 'The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary' Jesus was born '(c 4 B.C. – c A.D. 30)'.

JOHN BLANCHARD

According to John Blanchard, who states in his book: 'Why Believe The Bible' by John Blanchard – Evangelical press USA Fifth impression August 2007, page 5.

“Strictly speaking, the Bible is not a book at all, but a collection of sixty-six documents brought together over the course of about 1,500 years, the most recent dating from about A.D. 95.”

Ibid :⁴

We have the first oldest manuscripts dated 916 AD which is the Massoretic text. Then we have the Dead Sea Scrolls which brings the date a thousand years backwards. Blanchard reports as follows: “...the Dead Sea Scroll manuscript of a particular important chapter of the Bible is more than 1000 years older than the earliest copy we previously possessed...” (Reference: Why Believe The Bible’ by John Blanchard – Evangelical press USA Fifth impression August 2007, page 9)

JEHOVAH’S WITNESSES

Then the Jehovah’s Witnesses claim: “The Bible was written over a span of some 1,600 years, from 1513 B.E.C. to about 98 C.E.” (Reference: ‘Awake! November 2007 Special issue Can You Trust The Bible?’ page 7)

What does this mean? It means that the Jehovah’s Witnesses seems not to tell the truth. If the Dead Sea Scrolls is a thousand years older, then the Bible cannot be older than about 100 BC. **Even though the Dead Sea Scrolls are supposed to be the oldest, there is not one Bible that contains its contents. They were forced to keep the documents for fifty years in secret and had to kill John Marco Allegro⁵ - in order to protect the secret of their manipulations of the Scrolls.** So many controversial things were written about the Scrolls, but till today they have not been released, or even used in any of the Bibles.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses claim that their belief system and understanding of Jesus is not the same as other Christians, yet they use the same Bible of the Roman Catholic Church whose founder was the Great Pagan Constantine, and made further changes to the Holy fabricated reconstructed man-made Bible by removing verses in the New Testament. It could also be argued by the Jehovah’s Witnesses that today the newest Version of the Protestants’ Bible concur with theirs, that is, the Protestants has copied the Jehovah’s Witnesses by removing verses in the New Testament, as can be seen in the New International Version.

Tobias	(omitted)
Judith	(omitted)
Esther	Esther (a portion omitted)
Wisdom	(omitted)
Sirach	(omitted)
Baruch	(omitted)
Daniel	Daniel (part omitted)

8: : The new book ‘The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translated by Geza Vermes’ only mention his name on page 5, and on ⁵ page 21, Vermes says ‘This trend was continued with loud media support by J. M. Allegro’s speculation about the role of amanita muscaria, a hallucinogenic fungus, in the genesis of the Christian Church.’ but kept quiet about him being murdered. This fact tells a huge story!

The Jews, who accept only 39 books of the Old Testament, divide, them into groups, but in a different way than Christians:

After examining the above information one find it difficult to consider the Bible as a source of divine revelation or a book of inspired contents. The statement of the Roman Catholics that “Most Protestants, however, exclude from the Old Testament six complete books (seven, *if Baruch is considered a separate book*) and parts of two others” tells that there is no surety whether the book *Baruch* is really part of the Bible. The book *Baruch* is either a book of the Old Testament or it is simply not part of the words of God. ***This fact questions the authenticity of the first whole Bible.***

When the followers of the Roman Catholic Church decided to break away from the Church, and form Protestant Churches they must either have disagreed with the Bible not being the words of God or they disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests. If they disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests, then they would not have changed the Bible. However, they have changed the Bible which makes it clear that it was the first Bible which they could not tolerate. If they had only disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests or only one of the groups then they would never have changed the first Bible. Make no mistake, that those who broke away from the original Church must be termed as **apostates**. That is the first sin they committed; the second sin they committed is that they removed some books from the first Bible; the third sin they committed was that they changed the modus operandi of the Church.

Please keep in mind that we are not claiming that the Roman Catholics have the truth, as we have made our stand clear that they also do not possess the truth as by their own admission above, what we are doing is only revealing the state of those who broke away from the original Church. We shall reveal the state of all those who follows the Bible! One needs not to be a Professor in Theology to come to the conclusion that the Bible of all denominations is the main bone of contention.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses, this new sect emerged during 1931:

The Jehovah’s Witnesses who are supposed to have emerged from people who have studied the Bible, and called themselves ‘The Bible Students’. If they had studied the Bible they would have known that the book of Job cannot be the book of Moses. They placed the book as the fourth book of Moses in the above quotation, but placed the book of Job in their Bible as the eighteenth book. What does it mean? Is this the work of righteous men?

According to the Protestant information:

Book 18, Job:

“The author is unknown. Various suggestions have been made: Job, Elihu, Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, Hezekiah, Baruch the friend of Jeremiah, *etc.* None can be established.”⁶

⁶ : New Bible Commentary third edition 1988, p. 421.

At least they have tried their very best to give us some of the possibilities who could have been the author. There is a further report to be considered:

“The book is anonymous. The ‘official’ Talmudic tradition, followed by many earlier Christian writers, is that the book was written by Moses (*Baba Bathra 14b, seq.*), but the continuation of the passage and other statements show that this is merely a pious pronouncement, based presumably on a feeling of fitness, **and not to be taken seriously**” [*Our emphases*].⁷

Therefore, the information of the Jehovah’s Witnesses is not correct, it is revealing false information. Nay, it in fact questions the authenticity of the Bible.

When someone refers to the “*original Old Testament*”, what is he or she saying? Is the term “*original Old Testament*” based on any truth? Consequently, even a Bible with all the so-called ***original languages*** is not the truth. When the first apostates broke away from the Roman Catholic Church, was it not for the reason that they could not concur with the contents of the Bible? If it was not so, then, why remove some whole books and parts of the books from the Holy Bible? All Christians cannot substantiate with truthful evidence that any version of any of the Bibles is the truth.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses gives the impression that they are honest, but claims that Moses wrote the book called ‘Numbers’. Here follows the facts about their claim:

“Moses is not named as the author of any single part of the book, as he is named with regard to certain sections of Exodus (*cf. Ex. [Ex. = Exodus] 17:14; 24:4; 34:27*). It may be that a later writer set in order the Mosaic material of which Leviticus consists” [*Our emphases*].⁸

“**NUMBERS** is the fourth book of the Pentateuch, as the five books of the Law, or of Moses, have come to be called.”⁹

About the source it is stated:

“But, although the sources come from different ages and from writers of different schools of thought...”¹⁰

The highlight of this point is as follows:

“Many scholars today consider that the tradition according to which Moses is the author of the entire book must be seriously questioned.”¹¹

It appears to be clear that honesty seems not to be part of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ *modus operandi*.

⁷ : New Bible Dictionary second edition 1988, p. 598.

⁸ : New Bible Dictionary second edition 1988, p. 694.

⁹ : Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 16, fourteenth edition 1929, 1930, p. 601.

¹⁰ : *ibid.*

¹¹ : New Bible Dictionary second edition, p. 846.

We believe strongly that the creation of Israel in 1948 was as a direct result of the Scrolls. It seems to have been the bargaining chip for Israel and its protection. Before 1947 the Jews and Christians did not see eye to eye but suddenly after the discovery of the Scrolls things changed dramatically and so quickly and Israel was created under the auspices of the Christian nations.

The English Revised Standard Version -1980, on page iii. states:

“The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed was the work of William Tyndale. He met bitter opposition. **He was willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures, and his New Testament were ordered to be burned as “untrue translations.”** He was finally betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and in October, 1536, he was publicly executed and burned at the stake. **Yet Tyndale’s work became the foundation of subsequent English version”** [our emphases].

If Tyndale’s work was burnt and rejected as “untrue”, the question remains what was left. Assume the remains of his work were preserved, then it means the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on parts of his work. Our concern is that it would be extremely difficult to ascertain what an author articulated in his research if only a section of the research was used. Hence, if the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on a piece of incomplete work, how valid can such a version be? On the other hand, if none of his “untrue translations” could be retrieved, on what is the English version of the New Testament based? What is important to realize is the fact about the new claims Christians have produced. Today, every Christian believes that the original Scriptures of theirs are preserved in the original revealed language, which they are taught to believe that Jesus spoke.

REVEREND DUMMELOW

Below are a few quotations from Rev. Dummelow, which proves the alteration of the Bible text beyond all doubt:

“On close examination, however, it must be admitted that the Pentateuch reveals many features inconsistent with the traditional view that in its present form it is the work of Moses. For instance, it may be safely granted that Moses did not write the account of his own death in Dt. 34. The statement in Dt. 1:1 that Moses spoke these words beyond Jordan is evidently made from the standpoint of one living in Canaan, which Moses never did.... Other passages which can with difficulty be ascribed to him are Ex. 6:26, 27; 11:3; 16:35, 36; Lv. 18:24–28; Nu. 12:3; Dt. 2: 12” (Bible Commentary, p. xxiv).

And again: **“A careful examination has led many scholars to the conviction that the writings of Moses formed only the rough material or purport of the material, and that in its present form it is not the work of one man, but a compilation made from previously existing documents”** (p. xxvi). *Still again:* **“Similarly in the legislative portions of these books we find apparent contradictions and these not in minor or insignificant details, but in fundamental enactments”** (page xxvi).

The same author says the text of the New Testament is still more unreliable:

“To begin with, the writers of the Gospels report in Greek ... the sayings of Jesus Christ, who for the most part probably spoke Aramaic ... Not even in later centuries, do we find that scrupulous regard for the sacred text which marked the transmission of the Old Testament. A copyist would sometimes put in not what was in the text, but what he thought out to be in it. He would trust a fickle memory, or he would even make the text accord with the views of the school to which he belonged” (page xvi).

Therefore, without any truthful investigation they are made to believe that it was the Greek language that he spoke and therefore their Scriptures are in Greek. However, their own information is the source that a truthful investigator will discover that the established claims are not the truth! Every denomination of Christians has its own claims. Yet, collectively they seem to make the equivalent claim about the Greek Scriptures! After one has studied the formation of the first Church by Constantine, then it ought to be clear that it was impossible to retain the original Message brought by the Israelite Prophet because his Message did not concur with what Constantine wanted for his Empire. Therefore, if the original Message was still in existence at the time when Constantine began to develop his new religious ideology, then it must have been destroyed at that time. It could be that Arius (the leader of the Unitarians) had access to the original Message which led him and his people to oppose Constantine, but it was kept a close secret by the Christians. The reason for this assumption is clear as the various denominations own different versions of Biblical history which reveals that the Bibles did not originate from one source. Nor did the Bible translations originate from one source. The point about the divinity of Jesus says it all, which began in the year 381 AD which made him the ‘son of God’!

IN CLOSING:

From the above analysis it is clear that from the time of *the reformation* which led to the establishment of the Reformed and Protestant Churches only in the 16th century, the Catholics had only one Bible in the *Latin language*. This admission means that there was neither a Greek Bible nor the 916 AD Massoretic text from which the teachings of the Bible could be developed, as there were no original sources from which they could develop their teachings, hence their claim that the Greek version of the Bible is the original source is not true!

Let us again reiterate that the Bible was only in Latin:

“In those days only a few wealthy people possessed a Bible, which existed in no other language but Latin, for the Bibles had to be copied by hand as the printing press had not yet been invented. Consequently a Bible cost an enormous sum of money. Moreover not many were able to read at that time. Therefore the only way the common people could hear about the Gospel teaching was through itinerant preachers.” [New Apostolic Church, op. Cit, pp. 98-99.] [Itinerant means wandering, roaming, travelling, wandering, nomadic persons]

A FEW QUOTES FROM THE BIBLE WITH REFERENCES:

Any claim that God is the author of the Bible cannot be accepted. Our reasons for saying so are because the Bible has these verses:

Death to those who piss against the wall:

Piss Crimes: “therefore, behold, I will bring evil upon the house of Jerobo’am, and will cut off from Jerobo’am him that pisseth against the wall...” (I Kings 14:10)

Note, the word <pisseth> translates from the Hebrew word <shathan> [shaw-than'] which means to make water, i.e. urinate, or piss.

"And it came to pass, when he began to reign, as soon as he sat on his throne, that he slew all the house of Baasha: he left him not one that pisseth against a wall, neither of his kinsfolks, nor of his friends." (I Kings 16:11)

Eating of Human dung

“And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that cometh out of man, in their sight. And the LORD said, Even thus shall the children of Israel eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles, whither I will drive them.” (Ezekiel 4:12-13)

Eating of Human Dung and Drinking of Piss

“But Rabshakeh said unto them, Hath my master sent me to thy master, and to thee, to speak these words? hath he not sent me to the men which sit on the wall, that they may eat their own dung, and drink their own piss with you?” (II Kings 18:27)

Cannibalism

“And the king said unto her, What aileth thee? And she answered, This woman said unto me, Give thy son, that we may eat him to day, and we will eat my son tomorrow. So we boiled my son, and did eat him: and I said unto her on the next day, Give thy son, that we may eat him: and she hath hid her son....” (II Kings 6:28-29)

Finally we quote the following verses from *Al-Qur'ân* regarding the Bible:

Chapter 2 verse 113: “The Jews say: "the Christians¹² have naught (to stand) upon; and the Christians say: "the Jews¹³ have naught (to stand) upon." yet they (profess to) study the (same) Book. Like unto their word is what those say who know not; but Allâh will judge between them in their quarrel on the Day of Judgment.”

¹² The Catholic Church claims that there are about 124,000 manuscripts in their possession, but no two are alike.

¹³ The Jews dispute the Christians that Jesus is mentioned as a ‘son of God’ in the Old Testament, yet they both study and accept the same Old Testament

Chapter 2 verse 79: "Then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands, and then say: "This is from Allâh," to traffic with it for miserable price! - woe to them for what their hands do write, and for the gain they make thereby.¹⁴"

Chapter 3 verse 78: "There is among them a section who distorts the Book with their tongues: (as they read) you would think it is a part of the Book, but it is no part of the Book; and they say, "That is from Allâh," but it is not from Allâh. It is they who tell a lie against Allâh, and (well) they know it!"

Compiled by: Ahmed Moosa

(email: ymoosa786@hotmail.com)

Cape Town. November 2009

(E. & O. E)

QUR'ÂN:

There exist two written Qur'âns in the world today dating back about 1,400 years. One is in the Topkapi Museum in Turkey, and the other in Tashkent, in Uzbekistan. Both are identical in every letter and word. The one in Tashkent has a UNESCO certificate next to it and states that it dates back to the period of the Prophet Muhammad. I have visited Tashkent in December 2000 and saw the Qur'ân personally with the certificate of UNESCO.

EXTRACT OF ARTICLE BY IAN MAC WILLIAM -BBC NEWS. TASHKENT'S HIDDEN ISLAMIC RELIC

"The Othman Koran is the oldest in the world. In an obscure corner of the Uzbek capital, Tashkent, lays one of Islam's most sacred relics - the world's oldest Koran. It is a reminder of the role which Central Asia once played in Muslim history - a fact often overlooked after seven Decades of Soviet-imposed atheism....

"There are approximately 20,000 books and 3,000 manuscripts in this library," said Ikram Akhmedov, a young assistant in the mufti's office. "They deal with mediaeval history, astronomy and medicine. There are also commentaries on the Koran and books of law. But the oldest book here is the Othman Koran from the seventh century. **"This priceless Koran is kept in a special glass-fronted vault built into the wall of a tiny inner room.**

"The Koran was written on deerskin," said Mr. Akhmedov....It is said that Caliph Othman made five copies

¹⁴ We know that the Bible has been revised, changed numerous times and continues to be changed and revised and so it is a matter of making money

of the original Koran. A Koran now in the Topkapi Palace in Istanbul is said to be another of these original copies....

As a result, its greatest treasure, the world's oldest Koran, continues to sit quietly in the medieval quarter of old Tashkent". <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/4581684.stm>

Please follow this link to access free more documents on various topics from Al-Qur'ân Google drive:

<http://bit.do/quranonly>

No Copyrights on all the documents. Download for free!

- i. Biography of Muhammad the Messenger of Allâh from Al-Qur'ân only
- ii. The Meaning of Ahadîth from Al-Qur'ân
- iii. Meaning of Sunnah in Al- Qur'ân
- iv. Explanation of how to perform Salat from Al-Qur'ân
- v. Women's marriage Rights in Al-Qur'ân
- vi. History of the six hadîth writers
- vii. Sectarianism and its consequences stated in Al-Qur'ân
- viii. Law of Interpretation of Al- Qur'ân
- ix. No killing of apostates mentioned in Al-Qur'ân
- x. Proof why Al-Qur'ân is Divine
- xi. Qurânic explanation of chapter 14 verse 4
- xii. Guidelines- Understanding Al- Qur'ân
- xiii. Hijab: Is it Islamic or an innovation? – etc

Compiled by: Ahmed Moosa

ymoosa786@hotmail.com

NO COPYRIGHTS. FREE DOWNLOADS.